

GE998-058

said telematic tasks, when terminated, are not put into a suspended state.

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over SPIX in view of ASHBY.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over SPIX in view of ASHBY and further in view of WALLACE.

In order to better point out the invention, Claims 1-3 have been amended. The terms "static" and "dynamic" have been replaced with --motor vehicle control-- and --motor vehicle telematic-- respectively. It is believed that the Examiner has been interpreting these terms far too broadly in applying the cited art. The claim language has been modified also in order to more positively claim the distinguishing features.

As described in the specification, in the prior art, motor vehicle data processing tasks have been divided into two kinds (now called control tasks and telematic tasks in the claims), which normally have been handled separately and differently by different hardware. Prior art attempts to handle both of these types of tasks with only one operating system has led to disadvantages.

GE998-058

In accordance with the present invention, however, these two kinds of tasks are handled by one operating system without the prior art disadvantages. More specifically, the disadvantages of the prior art have been overcome by putting control tasks into a suspended mode when they are terminated while telematic tasks are terminated without putting them into suspended mode. This has been achieved in particular by extending the kernel of a single operating system rather than by using two operating systems or by adding a software layer to one operating system.

SPIX describes a very complex multiprocessor operating system that is also multithreaded and has no clear use on-board a motor vehicle. While such an operating system clearly suspends tasks that have not completed in favor of working on other tasks that have not completed, it is not clear that the SPIX operating system suspends one class of tasks **when they are terminated** (i.e., completed) while not suspending another class of tasks **when they are terminated** (i.e., completed). Even if SPIX does incidentally describe both ways of terminating tasks (which is not admitted), there is no teaching or suggestion of terminating **motor vehicle control** tasks by suspending them while terminating **motor vehicle telematic** tasks without suspending them, as now clearly claimed.

GE998-058

ASHBY does describe an operating system for use on a motor vehicle, but the ASHBY operating system is dedicated apparently to a navigation system (i.e., telematic system). ASHBY does not teach or suggest integrating motor vehicle control tasks with the navigation system tasks and does not teach or suggest terminating control tasks differently from telematic tasks as claimed.

While it is understood that these two references have been cited together, still there must be some teaching or suggestion in one of them to handle the termination of motor vehicle control tasks differently than motor vehicle telematic tasks as claimed. Otherwise, a person of ordinary skill would assume that both kinds of tasks will be handled similarly by a single operating system!

WALLACE describes a motor vehicle control system that is multi-tasking. Clearly tasks are suspended before they are completed in favor of making another task active. However, it is not clear that one kind of task is handled differently when it has been completed than another kind of task is handled when completed. It isn't even clear that WALLACE contemplates an integration of telematic tasks with control tasks. What is being handled appears to be "vehicle processes", which to a person of ordinary skill suggests control tasks.

GE998-058

CONCLUSIONS

It is believed that all of the pending claims fully meet all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and also distinguish readily over all of the cited art, when taken individually and in combination. Accordingly, allowance of the pending claims is believed to be in order and is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Ronald L. Drumheller', is written over a horizontal line.

Ronald L. Drumheller, Attorney  
Registration No. 25,674

Ronald L. Drumheller  
94 Teakettle Spout Road  
Mahopac, NY 10541  
Telephone: (845) 628-6090  
Facsimile: (845) 628-6197



RECEIVED  
FEB 27 2003  
Technology Center 2100

GE998-058

VERSION OF CLAIMS SHOWING CHANGES MADE

1. (AMENDED) Operating system for handling [dynamic] motor vehicle telematic tasks, [especially telematic functions in a motor vehicle,] wherein said telematic tasks are created, terminated and subsequently destroyed,

characterized in that

said operating system [is] also [able to handle static] handles motor vehicle control tasks by creating, terminating and subsequently putting said control tasks into a suspended state instead of destroying said control tasks, so that said control tasks can be reactivated, [if] when required, without rebuilding [any of their] control task resources.

2. (AMENDED) Operating system according to claim 1, characterized in that said suspended state is realized by extending the kernel of [the] said operating system [for handling dynamic tasks].

3. (AMENDED) Method of handling [dynamic] motor vehicle telematic tasks and [static] motor vehicle control tasks with a single operating system, [especially functions in a motor vehicle,]

[charcaterized] characterized in that

GE998-058

said [static] control tasks, [after termination] when terminated, are put into a suspended state, so that said control tasks can be reactivated, [if] when required, without rebuilding [any of their] control task resources; and

said telematic tasks, when terminated, are not put into a suspended state.